Remarks

Reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 4-36 remain pending.

In the Office Action, dated October 6, 2003, claims 1, 4, 7-15, 18-27 and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,819). Further, claims 5, 6, 16, 17, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. in view of Cain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,846). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse this rejection for the reasons below.

In one aspect of applicants' invention, system traffic of a clustered computing environment is controlled. In order to provide this control, a particular service node address is coupled based on network topology to a particular network object that holds information regarding that service node address. For example, as shown in FIG. 23, the network topology is defined by the association of a node address definition, a subnetwork definition and a network definition. The definition for a particular node address is used to point to a particular network definition via a subnetwork definition. Thus, the node address is mapped to the network definition data. Within the network definition data is a service routing table which includes the priority for that service. Thus, when there are a plurality of service node addresses, each address is mapped in such a way to obtain the plurality of priorities associated with the plurality of addresses. Then, a service is contacted based on the priorities.

In one example, applicants claim a method of controlling system traffic of a clustered computing environment (e.g., claim 1). The method includes, for instance, mapping one or more node addresses, for a service to be provided, to one or more network objects defined for the service, wherein the mapping of a node address maps the node address to a particular network object of a plurality of network objects based on network topology; obtaining from the one or more network objects one or more priorities of the service; and contacting the service based on the one or more priorities. Thus, in applicants' claimed invention, a node address is used to obtain a particular network object, which contains the priority associated with that node address in that network. Therefore, the priority for the service for a particular node address is obtained

POU920000008US1   - 2 -

from a network object associated with that node address. This is very different from the teachings of Miller.

For example, Miller describes the use of a name service to obtain a network address and additional information of a service, including a priority associated with that service. There is no description, teaching or suggestion in Miller of mapping a node address to a network object to obtain the priority from the network object. That is, there is no description, teaching or suggestion in Miller of using a node address to retrieve a priority. Instead, in Miller, the service requested by a client is used to find a server entry that includes the network address and other information, including the priority. There is no using the node address to obtain the priority. There is no mapping of the node address to obtain the network object that includes the priority, as claimed by applicants. The node address and priority data are in the same entry. The node address is not used to obtain the priority.

For example, in Col. 6, lines 58-65 of Miller it is described that when a client requests an interface which corresponds to a service group, the name service looks up information in the service group entry about the alternative servers, selects a compatible server and returns the network address to the client. Thus, the network address is merely returned to the client. Further, the attribute which includes priority, as described in Col. 7, lines 35-40, is just stored in the server entry that also includes that address. Thus, there is no need for a mapping of the node address based on topology to obtain a particular network object to obtain the priority. The priority is just another given in Miller, along with the address. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that Miller does not describe, teach or suggest applicants' claimed element of mapping one or more node addresses for services to be provided to one or more network objects defined for the service, wherein the mapping of a node address maps the node address to a particular network object of a plurality of network objects based on the network topology, and obtaining from the one or more network objects one or more priorities of the service. Again, the network address and the priority in Miller are merely information contained in a server entry which is provided to the client when a particular interface is selected. There is no teaching or suggestion of using the network address to perform any mapping to obtain priorities.

POU920000008US1   - 3 -

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and other similar claims are not anticipated by Miller. Further, applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features. Moreover, Cain does not overcome the deficiencies of Miller. Thus, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number, should the Examiner still have concerns regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: January 6, 2004.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579

POU920000008US1

- 4 -